Application No. 10/821,435 Docket No.: 21058/1209573-US2 Amendment dated January 21, 2009

Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2008

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12-14, 19 and 20 are currently amended. No new matter has been added

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner contends that the recited "one-time entropy generated session password" is unclear. Applicants have removed the word "session" from claims 1, 14 and 19 that was added in the previous amendment, and Applicants submit that the claims as thus amended, and amended as described below in response to the § 103 rejections, now particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter of the invention.

Further, Applicant has amended claim 20 to remove the terms "n" and "sim direct," and has reworded the remainder of claim 20 for clarity. The clarifications are supported in the specification at least at paragraphs [0033]-[0056]. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection of claims 1-20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-6, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0171112 to Lupper et al. ("Lupper"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,715,082 to Chang et al. ("Chang"). The Examiner contends that Lupper discloses the elements of claim 1 except that the passwords are one-time entropy passwords. The Examiner further contends that it would have been obvious to use a single use password as taught by Chang in order to reduce the security risks that are introduced from using fixed user information.

Applicants have amended base independent claims 1 and 14 to recite that the onetime entropy generated password is based on three separate items: an identification

6

Application No. 10/821,435 Docket No.: 21058/1209573-US2

Amendment dated January 21, 2009 Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2008

information of the client, an encryption key provided by the WPAN, and a text character string. A similar amendment has been made to claims 19 and 20. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least at paragraphs [0033]-[0039], in particular with [0038] showing that sim direct is a text character string having a predetermined value, e.g., "sim direct". As this is exemplary (see, e.g., [0033]), other predetermined values for the text character string may be possible. Neither Lupper nor Chang discloses a one-time entropy generated password based on all three of these items. Furthermore, the Examiner has admitted that Chang teaches that fixed user information in a password may create a security risk (Office Action, page 5, lines 1-2). Therefore, Chang teaches away from including a predetermined text string in the calculation of the password, and it would not be obvious to combine Lupper and Chang to provide the method or system recited in claims 1, 14 and 19.

Claims 2-6 and 15 depend upon one of base independent claims 1 or 14. Applicants submit that claims 2-6 and 15 are allowable by reason of their dependency upon an allowable base independent claim. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 14 and 15 over Lupper in view of Chang.

Claims 7-11, 16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupper in view of Chang, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,055 to Lupien et al. ("Lupien"). The Examiner relies upon Lupien as disclosing limitations of: (1) a password that is generated at a first station and compared with a password generated by a mobile terminal using the IMSI; (2) a password that is created independently by each of two entities utilizing the IMSI of the client; (3) a password that is created by utilizing a pseudonym of the client; (4) having adapters reside on separate devices; (5) having a fourth adapter for generating the password for the client; and (6) for claims 10-11, a password that is generated using cipher keys.

Docket No.: 21058/1209573-US2

Application No. 10/821,435 Amendment dated January 21, 2009 Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2008

Claims 7-11, 16, 18 depend upon one of base independent claims 1 or 14. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to recite a one-time entropy generated session password for a client that is based on an identification information of the client, an encryption key provided by the WPAN, and a predetermined text character string. The portion of Lupien cited by the Examiner discusses a random number (RAND) and security result (SRES), but does not discuss a predetermined text string. Applicant submits that no combination of Lupper, Chang or Lupien disclose or suggest a one-time entropy generated session password for a client that is based on an identification information of the client, an encryption key provided by the WPAN, and a predetermined text character string. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-11, 16, 18 over Lupper and Chang in view of Lupien.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupper, in view of Chang, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,197,765 to Chan et al. ("Chan"). The Examiner contends that Chan discloses generating passwords based on SHA hash information (citing abstract & col. 3, line 17), reading on a hash or hashing process.

Applicants have amended claims 12 and 13 to recite that the hash value is further processed by converting each octet of the hash value into an alphanumeric octet value. A similar change for sake of clarity rather than patentability has been made to claim 20. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at least within paragraphs [0039]-[0056], in particular that the converting described in [0044]-[0055] produces octet values given in [0041]-[0043], which are alphanumeric values.

Applicant submits that neither Lupper, Chang or Chan, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests converting each octet of the recited hash value into an alphanumeric octet. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12 and 13 over Lupper in view of Chang and Chan.

Application No. 10/821,435 Docket No.: 21058/1209573-US2
Amendment dated January 21, 2009

Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2008

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupper, in view of Chang, and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0051041 to Kalavade et al. ("Kalavade").

Claim 17 depends upon base independent claim 14. Applicants have amended claim 14 to recite a one-time entropy generated session password for a client that is based on an identification information of the client, an encryption key provided by the WPAN, and a predetermined text character string. Applicants submit that base independent claim 14 is allowable, and that claim 17 is allowable as dependent upon an allowable base claim. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 over Lupper in view of Chang and Kalavade.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lupper in view of Chang, and further in view of Lupien and Kalavade. Applicants have amended claim 19 to recite a one-time entropy generated session password for a client that is based on an identification information of the client, an encryption key provided by the WPAN, and a predetermined text character string. Applicants submit that for the reasons discussed above in connection with similar amendments to base independent claims 1 and 14, neither Lupper, Chang, Lupien or Kalavade, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the elements recited in amended claim 19. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 over Lupper in view of Chang, and further in view of Lupien and Kalavade.

Application No. 10/821,435 Docket No.: 21058/1209573-US2 Amendment dated January 21, 2009

Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2008

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Office Action mailed October 17, 2008 has been addressed on the basis of the above remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: January 21, 2009 Respectfully submitted,

By /Alexander D. Walter/
Alexander D. Walter
Registration No.: 60,419
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attomeys/Agents For Applicant